Environmental Checklist Form (Initial Study)

County of Los Angeles, Department of Regional Planning

Project title: R2011-00719 / CUP201100066 / RENVT201100100

Project location: 4118 Athenian Way, Los Angeles (Ladera Heights/Viewpark – Windsor Hills)
APN: 5011-021-003 *Thomas Guide*: 673-D4 *USGS Quad*: Hollywood, Inglewood

Gross Acreage: 1.23

Description of project: The applicant, California American Water Company (Cal Am Water), is requesting a conditional use permit, as provided for in Section 22.20.100 of Title 22 of the County Code, to memorialize its consultation with the County as the local land use authority as required by California Public Utilities Commission General Order 103A regarding the location of the existing 1.23 acre Olympiad reservoir site, and regarding the replacement of an existing 916 sq. ft. water supply booster station by constructing a new 1,490 sq. ft. booster station on the site, and to install a new dechlorination vault. The site currently contains a 1.25 million gallon reinforced concrete reservoir covered with a geodesic dome and a separate booster station building. The existing facilities were originally constructed in 1938. At that time, no use permit was required. In 1971, the County amended the zoning ordinance for this zone to require a use permit for water production facilities and set an "amortization period" depending on the type of facility.

Cal Am Water prepares studies of its distribution system at approximately 5-year intervals. Called "condition based assessments," a condition based assessment was conducted for the Olympiad booster station and concluded that the booster station should be replaced. A new booster station would replace the existing booster station that is over 70 years old and is difficult to maintain because the building was not designed to accommodate the electrical equipment necessary to operate a modern water distribution system. The existing booster station will remain in service until the new booster pump station is completed and operational. The new booster pump station will consist of four vertical turbine pumps; three (3) 830 gallon per minute (gpm) pumps and one (1) 1,000 gpm pump and the provision for a fifth pump (1,000 gpm) in the future. All pumps, motors, and facility mechanical and electrical components will be enclosed within the new booster station building. The applicant expects to implement the following steps to install the new pump station and demolish the existing pump station: a) Clear and grub the site; b) Rough grading of the yard area; c) Installation of new buried yard piping, including piping within the building; d) Excavate a 55 ft. by 30 ft. area with appropriate slope cutbacks for new pump station foundation (done concurrently with yard piping installation). Grading will be balanced onsite with 255 cu. yd. cut and 255 cu. yd. fill; e) The building will be constructed of concrete masonry unit walls (including a sound wall) and wood roof trusses; f) Interior equipment will be installed, including pumps, piping, controls, and electrical equipment; g) After the new pump station is operating, the existing pump station will be demolished; h) Paving and landscaping will be installed. The construction equipment expected to be used includes a backhoe loader, track loader and roller. Materials and equipment delivery will consist of pickup trucks, dump trucks, semi trucks, and concrete trucks.

The installation of the dechlorination vault allows the applicant to comply with various environmental protection or other regulatory requirements. In the event it were necessary to drain all or a portion of the reservoir, current Regional Water Quality Control Board permits require the applicant to dechlorinate the water before being discharged into the storm drain system per American Water Works Association guidelines for dechlorination practices. The dechlorination vault would allow the applicant to perform that process in a controlled area. Dechlorination of potable water is a typical procedure, and frequently occurs in the street when hydrants are flushed or water main leaks are repaired. Water is dechlorinated by introducing a product called Vita-D-Chlor tablets, which is made up of ascorbic acid (aka vitamin C), into the water. Vita-D-Chlor is 100% organic and is non-toxic to humans and animals. No other types of substances or chemicals will be used in the vault. It is not the intent of the applicant to store the tablets on site. However, future regulations may require the applicant to do so, in which case the tablets would be stored in a 35 pound bucket in the booster station building or some tablets would be stored in the dechlorination vault.

The project does not include modifications to the reservoir itself; however, some additional grading will be done adjacent to the reservoir when the existing booster station building is demolished. As part of that grading, additional erosion control features will be installed, consisting of riprap around the tank exterior. California American Water does not anticipate changes to its operations as a result of the replacement of the booster station. The newer equipment is expected to be more energy efficient.

The facility currently includes a concrete pad and electrical connection where a diesel-fueled backup generator is connected during power outages. Cal Am Water has not stored a generator at the site in over a year. A generator is brought in as-needed, typically during power outages. The project will not change the use of a backup generator, but simply relocate the generator staging area approximately 100 feet northeast from its current location to a location north of and adjacent to the new booster station building. This would bring the location of the backup generator slightly closer to the residences located along Athenian Way.

Regular site visits will be conducted by employees of Cal Am Water inspectors and engineers. There will be no full-time employees working on the site. Under normal operations, two employees would inspect the site typically 5 hours per week. Additional employees may visit the site from time to time, but such visits are sporadic and not capable of estimation.

General plan designation: 1 – Low Density Residential (1 to 6 du/ac)
Community/Area wide Plan designation: N/A
Zoning: R-1 (Single-family Residence)

Surrounding land uses and setting: The project site is located in an urbanized, hilly area surrounded by single-family residences. The site contains a potable water reservoir and a booster pump building. Vegetation on site consists of evergreen trees to screen the existing facility from surrounding homes.

Public agency approvals which may be required:

Public Agency	*Approval Required*
County of Los Angeles, Department of Regional Planning	Conditional Use Permit

Major projects in the area:

Project/Case No.	*Description and Status*
TR060002	*One multi-family lot (72 attached condos) and one office lot on 1.84 acres (Pending)*
PM21052	*4 SF lots on 0.77 acres (Inactive)*
PM065181	*4 SF lots on 0.98 acres (Pending)*
_____	_____
_____	_____

Reviewing Agencies:

Responsible Agencies

- ☒ None
- Regional Water Quality Control Board:
  - ☐ Los Angeles Region
  - ☐ Lahontan Region
- ☐ Coastal Commission
- ☐ Army Corps of Engineers

Special Reviewing Agencies

- ☒ None
- ☐ Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy
- ☐ National Parks
- ☐ National Forest
- ☐ Edwards Air Force Base
- ☐ Resource Conservation District of Santa Monica Mountains Area

Regional Significance

- ☒ None
- ☐ SCAG Criteria
- ☐ Air Quality
- ☐ Water Resources
- ☐ Santa Monica Mtns. Area
- ☐

Trustee Agencies

- ☒ None
- ☐ State Dept. of Fish and Game
- ☐ State Dept. of Parks and Recreation
- ☐ State Lands Commission
- ☐ University of California (Natural Land and Water Reserves System)

County Reviewing Agencies

- ☒ DPW:
  - Land Development Division (Grading & Drainage)
  - Geotechnical & Materials Engineering Division
  - Watershed Management Division (NPDES)
  - Environmental Programs Division
  - Waterworks Division
- ☒ Fire Department -Planning Division
- ☐ Sanitation District
- ☒ Public Health: Environmental Hygiene (Noise)
- ☐ Sheriff Department
- ☐ Parks and Recreation
- ☐ Subdivision Committee
- ☐

Lead agency name and address:
County of Los Angeles
Department of Regional Planning
320 West Temple Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Project sponsor's name and address:
California American Water Company
4701 Beloit Drive
Sacramento, CA 95838

Contact person and phone number: Steve Mar, (213) 974-6435

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project.

☐ Aesthetics	☐ Greenhouse Gas Emissions	☐ Population/Housing
☐ Agriculture/Forest	☐ Hazards/Hazardous Materials	☐ Public Services
☐ Air Quality	☒ Hydrology/Water Quality	☐ Recreation
☒ Biological Resources	☐ Land Use/Planning	☐ Transportation/Traffic
☐ Cultural Resources	☐ Mineral Resources	☐ Utilities/Services
☐ Energy	☐ Noise	☒ Mandatory Findings of Significance
☐ Geology/Soils		

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Department.)
On the basis of this initial evaluation:

☐ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☒ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

_____ _____
Signature Date

_____ _____
Signature Date

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources the Lead Department cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).

2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.

3) Once the Lead Department has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.

4) "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level. (Mitigation measures from Section XVII, "Earlier Analyses," may be cross-referenced.)

5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA processes, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. (State CEQA Guidelines § 15063(c)(3)(D).) In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:

   a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.

   b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of, and adequately analyzed in, an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.

   c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.

6) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.

7) The explanation of each issue should identify: the significance threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question, and; mitigation measures identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance. Sources of thresholds include the County General Plan, other County planning documents, and County ordinances. Some thresholds are unique to geographical locations.

8) Climate Change Impacts: When determining whether a project's impacts are significant, the analysis should consider, when relevant, the effects of future climate change on : 1) worsening hazardous conditions that pose risks to the project's inhabitants and structures (e.g., floods and wildfires), and 2) worsening the project's impacts on the environment (e.g., impacts on special status species and public health).

1. AESTHETICS

Would the project:	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista, including County-designated scenic resources areas (scenic highways as shown on the Scenic Highway Element, scenic corridors, scenic hillsides, and scenic ridgelines)?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The project is not located near a scenic vista or other scenic resource area. (State of California Department of Transportation)

b) Be visible from or obstruct views from a regional riding or hiking trail?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The project is not located near a riding or hiking trail. (County of Los Angeles Bicycle Master Plan)

c) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, historic buildings, or undeveloped or undisturbed areas?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The project site does not contain any rock outcroppings, historic buildings, or any or scenic resources. Existing mature and well established landscaping on the site will be removed and replaced with new drought-tolerant plants as shown on the Planting Plan. (Planting Plan, Los Angeles County Historic Properties Database)

d) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings because of height, bulk, pattern, scale, character, or other features?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The existing visual character baseline condition of the site consists of the existing concrete reservoir with an aluminum geodesic dome roof, the existing pump station, and existing landscaping. No modifications will be made to the reservoir and will have no impact to the existing visual characteristics of the reservoir. The proposed booster station building, exclusive of the roof, will be between approximately 6 to eight feet above grade and approximately 11.5 to 12.5 feet above grade including the roof. The proposed booster station building will be set back 20 feet from the property line and will extend approximately 27 percent of the property's frontage on Athenian Way. The building will be constructed of split block material, which is consistent with most public facilities, such as park buildings. The block structure will be partially screened by plants as described in the Planting plan. These features are not materially different in height, bulk, pattern, scale or character of other buildings in the area. The booster station building will be partially below grade when viewed from street level along Athenian Way and is expected to block some of the current view of the aluminum geodesic dome on the water tank. The view of the dome is not considered to be a significant scenic resource. (Site Plan)

e) Create a new source of substantial shadows, light, or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The project does not create substantial shadows or create substantial external light sources. (Site Plan)

2. AGRICULTURE / FOREST

Would the project:	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, with a designated Agricultural Opportunity Area, or with a Williamson Act contract?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code § 12220 (g)) or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined in Public Resources Code § 4526)?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The project site does not contain any farmland, forest, or agricultural uses. (Land Use Map, California Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program)

3. AIR QUALITY

Would the project:	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of applicable air quality plans of the South Coast AQMD (SCAQMD) or the Antelope Valley AQMD?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Violate any applicable federal or state air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation (i.e. exceed the State's criteria for regional significance which is generally (a) 500 dwelling units for residential uses or (b) 40 gross acres, 650,000 square feet of floor area or 1,000 employees for nonresidential uses)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Exceed a South Coast AQMD or Antelope Valley AQMD CEQA significance threshold?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Otherwise result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) Expose sensitive receptors (e.g., schools, hospitals, parks) to substantial pollutant concentrations due to location near a freeway or heavy industrial use?	☐	☐	☒	☐
f) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The project involves the continued operation of the existing reservoir as well as the replacement of existing booster station within the same site. There will be no increase of emissions above current baseline levels due to the continued operation of the reservoir, and the operation of the project would not conflict with

any applicable air quality plans. Current baseline conditions include the provision of an emergency backup diesel generator. California American Water maintains current permits issued by the California Air Resources Board authorizing the operation of the diesel generator. The project includes relocating the connection point for a backup diesel generator to the booster station building; the connection point is currently on the west side of the existing booster station. The new connection point will be north of the new booster station. Under current operations, water storage capacity within the system limits the need for a backup generator during brief power outages. Under current operations, if there were a longer disruption in electrical service, the applicant may need to operate a backup generator to maintain system pressure and storage levels in the reservoir. The applicant cannot, with certainty, predict the frequency or duration of future disruptions in electrical service, nor water system demands during any such future power outage. Therefore, emissions from the backup generator would depend upon frequency of use during power outages and water demands during such outages. The backup generator is currently not stored on the site and is brought in on an as-needed basis. Because the project does not involve an increase in generator operations from that which currently exists, the project will not result in exposing sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations compared to current baseline operations.

The use of construction equipment to construct the replacement booster station and demolish the existing booster station will result in emissions of criteria pollutants, asbestos, and diesel particulate associated with diesel fuel combustion. Estimates of construction equipment emissions are less than 20 percent of the South Coast AQMD's CEQA thresholds, and therefore will have a less than significant effect on air quality. For grading operations, the applicant will employ standard dust control measures, including water, to minimize particulate emissions associated with grading and demolition. Due to the age of the building, it is possible that the building materials could contain asbestos. The applicant will retain a certified asbestos inspector to determine the presence of asbestos in the materials before demolition commences. If asbestos is detected in the building material, the applicant will implement the protections contained in 40 C.F.R Subpart M, section 61.140 et seq., relating to the disturbance and disposal of asbestos-containing materials, as well as OSHA requirements for worker protection. Implementing these measures will prevent the release of asbestos into the ambient air in significant concentrations. (Olympiad Pumping Station Air Quality Study – April 25, 2012)

4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game (DFG) or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)?	☐	☒	☐	☐

A review of current habitat designations and plans have not identified this area as supporting candidate, sensitive, or special status species. To the extent that the existing landscaping vegetation to be removed from the site may provide nesting locations, the applicant will conduct pre-construction nesting surveys and will appropriately mitigate any impacts to nesting birds, if any nests are found. Otherwise, continued operation of the reservoir facility will have no effect on any listed or other species compared to baseline conditions as no changes are proposed to the existing operations. (Site Plan)

b) Have a substantial adverse effect on sensitive natural communities (e.g., riparian habitat, coastal sage scrub, oak woodlands, non-jurisdictional wetlands) identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations DFG or USFWS? These communities include Significant Ecological Areas (SEAs) identified in the General Plan, SEA Buffer Areas, and Sensitive Environmental Resource Areas (SERAs) identified in the Coastal Zone Plan.	☐	☐	☐	☒

The project site does not contain sensitive natural communities nor is it located within an SEA, SERA, or SEA buffer area. Continued operation of the reservoir facility will have no effect on any sensitive natural communities compared to baseline conditions as no changes are proposed to the existing operations. (Los Angeles County General Plan)

c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands (including marshes, vernal pools, and coastal wetlands) or waters of the United States, as defined by § 404 of the Clean Water Act through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	☐	☒	☐	☐

Stormwater in the View Park area drains via the local storm sewer system and ultimately reaches Ballona Creek, which is part of the Ballona Creek Watershed that includes the State owned and protected Ballona Wetlands. The applicant will employ standard erosion control measures as required by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board for construction activities to ensure that soil erosion into the local storm sewer system would be minimized. To the extent that the construction activities may result in on-site

erosion into the local storm sewer system and ultimately into the Ballona Creek Watershed, the erosion control measures will mitigate the potential impacts of this erosion on water quality to a less than significant level. Otherwise, continued operation of the reservoir facility will have no effect on any federally protected wetlands or waters compared to baseline conditions as no changes are proposed to the existing operations.

d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The site is located in a fully urbanized area and has a small chance of supporting significant amounts of wildlife species, migratory corridors, or wildlife nursery sites. Vegetation that will be removed on the site will be replaced with new vegetation. Any interference of wildlife species would be temporary and less than significant. Continued operation of the reservoir facility will have no effect on any wildlife species, migratory corridors, or wildlife nursery sites compared to baseline conditions as no changes are proposed to the existing operations.

e) Convert oak woodlands (as defined by the state, oak woodlands are oak stands with greater than 10% canopy cover with oaks at least 5" inch in diameter measured at 4.5 feet above mean natural grade) or otherwise contain oak or other unique native trees (junipers, Joshuas, etc.)?	☐	☐	☐	☒

There are no oak woodlands, individual oak trees, or unique native trees on the site. (Site Plan/Project Application)

f) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, including Wildflower Reserve Areas (L.A. County Code, Title 12, Ch. 12.36) and the Los Angeles County Oak Tree Ordinance (L.A. County Code, Title 22, Ch. 22.56, Part 16)?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The project does not conflict with policies or ordinances protecting biological resources. No such biological resources described in these ordinances are found on the site. Continued operation of the reservoir facility will have no effect on any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources compared to baseline conditions as no changes are proposed to the existing operations. (Site Plan, Los Angeles County Code)

g) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted state, regional, or local habitat conservation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The project site does not contain any adopted habitat conservation plans.

The site is located in a fully urbanized area and contains no sensitive populations of flora or fauna. There are no natural or artificial geographical features that would support significant biological resources on the site. Pre-construction nesting surveys will be conducted prior to removal of the existing landscaping vegetation and will appropriately mitigate any impacts to nesting birds, if any, are found. The applicant will employ standard erosion control measures as required by the California Regional Water Quality Control

Board for construction activities to ensure that soil erosion into the local storm sewer system would be minimized. Continued operation of the reservoir facility will have no effect on any biological resources compared to baseline conditions as no changes are proposed to the existing operations.

5. CULTURAL RESOURCES

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines § 15064.5?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The water reservoir and its facilities were constructed on the site in approximately 1938. The geodesic dome was installed over the reservoir in the late 1970s. Despite the age of the facility, there are no recognized historical resources or structures identified on the project site. Continued operation of the reservoir facility will have no effect on any historical resources compared to baseline conditions as no changes are proposed to the existing operations. (Los Angeles County Historic Properties Database)

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15064.5?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The site has been developed as a water reservoir facility since 1938. Most of the site has been graded and/or previously disturbed such that discovery of any undiscovered archaeological resources is low. To the extent that undiscovered archaeological resources may still exist on the site, the applicant will stop construction activities and implement industry-standard measures to evaluate, excavate, and catalog those resources. Continued operation of the reservoir facility will have no effect on any archaeological resources compared to baseline conditions as no changes are proposed to the existing operations.

c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature, or contain rock formations indicating potential paleontological resources?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The site has been developed as a water reservoir facility since 1938. Most of the site has been graded and/or previously disturbed such that discovery of any undiscovered paleontological resources is low. To the extent that undiscovered paleontological resources may still exist on the site, the applicant will stop construction activities and implement industry-standard measures to evaluate, excavate, and catalog those resources. Continued operation of the reservoir facility will have no effect on any unique paleontological or geologic resources compared to baseline conditions as no changes are proposed to the existing operations.

d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The site has been developed as a water reservoir facility since 1938. Most of the site has been graded and/or previously disturbed such that discovery of any undiscovered human remains is low. To the extent that undiscovered human remains may still exist on the site, the applicant will stop construction activities and implement industry-standard measures to evaluate, excavate, and catalog those remains. Continued operation of the reservoir facility will have no effect on the potential to disturb any human remains compared to baseline conditions as no changes are proposed to the existing operations.

6. ENERGY

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
Would the project:				
a) Comply with Los Angeles County Green Building Ordinance (L.A. County Code Title 22, Ch. 22.52, Part 20 and Title 21, § 21.24.440) or Drought Tolerant Landscaping Ordinance (L.A. County Code, Title 21, § 21.24.430 and Title 22, Ch. 22.52, Part 21)?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The replacement booster station complies with Los Angeles County Green Building Standards and improves upon current baseline conditions for energy consumption and conservation. The project consists of the ccontinued operations of the existing reservoir and replacing old, existing equipment with newer, more efficient equipment and planting new drought tolerant landscaping. No modifications will be made to the existing reservoir itself. Therefore, the project does not conflict with Los Angeles County Green Building Standards and meets the drought-tolerant landscaping requirements of the Los Angeles County Code. (Los Angeles County Code, Project Application)

b) Involve the inefficient use of energy resources (see Appendix F of the CEQA Guidelines)?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The project consists of the continued operations of the existing reservoir and replacing old, existing equipment with newer, more efficient equipment. There are currently 4 booster pumps with efficiencies from 44% to 80%. The project will install four new pumps with the provision to add a fifth pup in the future. The new pumps will be more efficient than the existing pumps and have efficiencies of at least 80% and will result in reduced energy usage from existing conditions. The continued operation of the reservoir facility will not result in a change in energy consumption compared to baseline operations; to the extent that the reservoir facility depends on the booster station for supply, there will be a net decrease in energy consumption in operation of the reservoir.

7. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
Would the project:				
a) Be located in an active or potentially active fault zone, Seismic Hazards Zone, or Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone, and expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault.	☐	☐	☐	☒

The project site is not located in a seismic hazard zone or on an earthquake fault. The nearest seismic zone is located about 1,600 ft. west of the project site and the nearest fault is located more than 1,800 ft. west of the project site. (California Geological Survey – Seismic Hazard Zone Map)

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The project site is not located in a seismic hazard zone or on an earthquake fault that would be subject to strong seismic ground shaking. The nearest seismic zone is located about 1,600 ft. west of the project site and the nearest fault is located more than 1,800 ft. west of the project site. (California Geological Survey – Seismic Hazard Zone Map)

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The project site is not located in a known liquefaction zone. The nearest liquefaction zone is located 3,000 ft. west of the project site. (California Geological Survey – Alquist- Priolo Map)

iv) Landslides?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The project site is not located in a known landslide zone. The project site does not contain steep slopes that would cause a significant landslide if one were to occur. The nearest landslide zone is located 600 ft. northwest of the project site. (California Geological Survey – Seismic Hazard Zone Map)

The most recent structural inspection of the reservoir was completed in 2008. The inspection included the use of a diver to inspect the interior of the reservoir tank. The dome structure was noted to be in good condition with some minor corrosion in select locations. The reservoir tank itself was also reported to be in good condition and noted to have 20 years or more of life. The inspection revealed some hairline cracks in the concrete that need to be sealed. Other maintenance recommended included miscellaneous upgrades in regards to safety (i.e. ladders). Regular inspections and maintenance of the facility will not be affected by the project and impacts from seismic hazards would be less than significant compared to current baseline conditions.

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

The project will not remove substantial amounts of topsoil or create soil erosion during or after construction. Ground disturbance during construction will be minimal and best management practices will be in place to minimize soil erosion.

c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

The project is not located in an area with unstable soil. Construction of the new booster station and associated piping does not directly affect the soil stability of the existing reservoir nor does it affect the reservoir's structural integrity. (California Geological Survey – Seismic Hazard Zone Map)

d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

The booster station replacement will adhere to current building codes that would minimize the exposure of the new booster station building to expansive soils. The continued operation of the reservoir facility will have no effect compared to baseline conditions with regard to the risks associated with expansive soil as no changes are proposed to the existing operations.

e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

The project does not include the use of septic systems. (Project Application)

f) Conflict with the Hillside Management Area Ordinance (L.A. County Code, Title 22, § 22.56.215) or hillside design standards in the County General Plan Conservation and Open Space Element? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

The Hillside Management Area Ordinance and hillside design standards do not apply to this project because the site is not located in a County-designated hillside area. (Los Angeles County Code)

8. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
Would the project:				
a) Generate greenhouse gas (GhGs) emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment (i.e., on global climate change)? Normally, the significance of the impacts of a project's GhG emissions should be evaluated as a cumulative impact rather than a project-specific impact.	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases including regulations implementing AB 32 of 2006, General Plan policies and implementing actions for GhG emission reduction, and the Los Angeles Regional Climate Action Plan?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The project consists of the continued operation of the existing reservoir facility and replacing old, existing equipment with newer, more efficient equipment. There are currently 4 booster pumps with efficiencies from 44% to 80%. The project will install four new pumps with the provision to add a fifth pump in the future. The new pumps will be more efficient than the existing pumps and have efficiencies of at least 80%. The new booster station would consume less energy as compared to the existing facility and, therefore, would result in less than significant greenhouse gas emissions. In addition, the new landscaping plan calls for drought tolerant, native, and otherwise "California friendly" plant species, which is expected to result in a net decrease in water consumption for the site which would, in turn, reduce GHG emissions. During construction, it is estimated that GHGs in construction equipment exhaust would be less than significant based on the duration and intensity of construction activities. Construction equipment used for the project would also implement current emissions controls that would reduce GHG emissions by being more efficient than construction equipment used in the past. Based on these standard, the project will generate a less than significant amount of GHGs due to construction

9. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, storage, production, use, or disposal of hazardous materials or use of pressurized tanks on-site?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The project does not contain hazardous materials stored on the site. To comply with recent environmental protection laws, the applicant may use a product called Vita-D-Chlor tablets in the proposed dechlorination vault in the event it were necessary to drain the reservoir. Vita-D-Chlor tablets, which are made up of ascorbic acid (aka vitamin C), are 100% organic and non-toxic to humans and animals. No other types of substances or chemicals will be used in the vault. Under existing conditions, the dechlorination of this drainage would occur through the use of Vita-D-Chlor in temporary facilities prior to the discharge entering the storm drain system.

b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials or waste into the environment?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Continued operation of the reservoir facility does not involve the use of hazardous materials or waste that could create a significant hazard due to a reasonably foreseeable upset or accident. Due to the age of the existing booster station, it is possible that the building materials could contain asbestos. The applicant will retain a certified asbestos inspector to determine the presence of asbestos in the materials before demolition commences. If asbestos is detected in the building material, the applicant will implement the protections contained in 40 C.F.R Subpart M, section 61.140 et seq., relating to the disturbance and disposal of asbestos-containing materials, as well as OSHA requirements for worker protection. Implementing these measures will prevent the release of asbestos into the ambient air in significant concentrations.

c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within 500 feet of sensitive land uses (e.g., homes, schools, hospitals)?	☐	☐	☒	☐

As noted in the air quality section, construction of the new booster station and demolition of the existing booster station is expected to result in the emission of asbestos and diesel particulate. Refer to the Air Quality discussion for those impacts and mitigation measures The normal operation of the reservoir facility typically does not emit hazardous emissions or involve the handling of hazardous materials as no changes are proposed to the existing operations.

d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code § 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the	☐	☐	☐	☒

environment?

The project site is not located on a hazardous materials site. (California Department of Toxic Substances Control/Envirostor database)

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan, or where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The project is not located near a public airport.

f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip.

g) Impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The project would not impair with or interfere with any adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.

h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving fires, because the project is located:

i) in a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones (Zone 4)?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The project is not located in a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone. (County of Los Angeles Fire Department – Pre-Fire Management Plan)

ii) in a high fire hazard area with inadequate access?	☐	☐	☐	☒

_____

iii) in an area with inadequate water and pressure to meet fire flow hazards?	☐	☐	☒	☐

_____

iv) in proximity to land uses that have the potential for dangerous fire hazard (such as refineries, flammables, and explosives manufacturing)?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The project is not located in a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone nor is it located in proximity to land uses that have the potential for dangerous fire hazards. The nearest Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone to the project site is located more than 370 ft. to the north. Construction and implementation of the project will not significantly change current emergency access or fire flow conditions at the site. Emergency access to the reservoir will actually improve by moving the booster station from its current location 15 feet from the reservoir to its proposed location approximately 30 feet away from the reservoir. (County of Los Angeles Fire Department – Pre-Fire Management Plan)

10. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	☐	☒	☐	☐

The project does not include any modifications to the existing reservoir itself. Therefore, there are no hydrology or water quality impacts associated with the continued operations of the facility. The only activity associated with the project that could affect water quality would be erosion associated with the construction activities. The applicant will employ standard erosion control measures as required by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board for construction activities. To the extent that the construction activities may result in on-site erosion, the erosion control measures will mitigate the potential impacts of this erosion on water quality to a less than significant level. Neither construction activities or the new booster station will affect the potable water supply that is stored and distributed through the Olympiad Reservoir's facilities (Site Plan/Project Application)

b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The existing facility and proposed booster station assists in the distribution of water and does not directly extract groundwater for use. The project contemplates the use of water for dust control purposes which would be supplied by local hydrants supplied by Cal Am Water. The estimated consumption of water is 500 gallons per day over 10 days of construction. The applicant's existing pump station has delivered on average 900,000 gallons of water per day, with a declining consumption trend. The water used for dust control represents 0.06 percent of the water this system has historically delivered, and will have a less than significant effect on water consumption associated with construction activities.

The landscaping plan calls for the replacement of existing vegetation with drought tolerant, native, and otherwise "California friendly" plant species, which is expected to result in a net decrease in water consumed for irrigation purposes at the site.

The project also includes the addition of a permanent restroom for employee use, in lieu of the existing portable facilities. An ultra-low flow flush toilet will be installed in the permanent restroom. The restroom will be used sporadically during the week; employees typically inspect the facility 5 hours per week. Even with the replacement of portable restroom facilities with a permanent restroom, overall water consumption on the site would not significantly increase over current baseline conditions since the project also implements drought-tolerant landscaping which would reduce overall water consumption. Overall water consumption even with the addition of restroom facilities would, therefore, be less than significant. (Site

Plan/Project Application)

c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

The project will not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern on the site. There are no streams or riverbeds located on the site. The overall amount of impermeable surfaces on the site will slightly increase due to the increased size of the new booster station, but the increase is considered to be less than significant and the drainage pattern will not be significantly altered from current baseline amounts. No construction or encroachments are currently occurring or planned on any existing drainage easements on or off the site. Therefore there will not be a significant amount of erosion or siltation that will occur on the site. Project construction will follow Los Angeles County Best Management Practices for storm and surface water management and will minimize erosion. In addition, the grading plan has site improvements to control erosion issues on site after construction, including riprap around the existing tank.

d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

The project will not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern on the site. There are no streams or riverbeds located on the site. The overall amount of impermeable surfaces on the site will slightly increase due to the increased size of the new booster station, but the increase is considered to be less than significant and surface runoff amounts will not be significantly greater than current baseline amounts. No construction or encroachments are currently occurring or planned on any existing drainage easements on or off the site. Therefore there will not be a significant amount of surface runoff that would result in flooding. Project construction will follow Los Angeles County Best Management Practices for storm and surface water management.

e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

The project will not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern on the site. The overall amount of impermeable surfaces on the site will slightly increase due to the increased size of the new booster station, but the increase is considered to be less than significant and surface runoff amounts will not be significantly greater than current baseline amounts. No construction or encroachments are currently occurring or planned on any existing drainage easements on or off the site. Therefore there will not be a significant amount of surface runoff that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems.

f) Generate construction or post-construction runoff that would violate applicable stormwater NPDES permits or otherwise significantly affect surface water or groundwater quality? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

The applicant will follow Los Angeles County Best Management Practices for storm and surface water

management and employ standard erosion control measures as required by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board for construction activities. The overall amount of impermeable surfaces on the site will slightly increase due to the increased size of the new booster station, but the increase is considered to be less than significant. The project does not violate any stormwater NPDES permits and affects on surface runoff amounts or ground water quality will be less than significant.

g) Conflict with the Los Angeles County Low Impact Development Ordinance (L.A. County Code, Title 12, Ch. 12.84 and Title 22, Ch. 22.52)?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The project conforms to the Los Angeles County Low Impact Development Ordinance.

h) Result in point or nonpoint source pollutant discharges into State Water Resources Control Board-designated Areas of Special Biological Significance?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The project does not discharge any sort of pollutants into an Area of Special Biological Significance (http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/ocean/asbs_map.shtml).

i) Use septic tanks or other private sewage disposal system in areas with known septic tank limitations or in close proximity to a drainage course?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The project does not utilize septic tanks. The new on-site restroom will connect to the municipal sewage system.

j) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The installation of a new booster station will not affect the existing water quality of the facility.

k) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map, or within a floodway or floodplain?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The project does not contain housing and is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area. (Site Plan, FEMA)

l) Place structures, which would impede or redirect flood flows, within a 100-year flood hazard area, floodway, or floodplain?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The project is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area, floodway, or floodplain. (Site Plan, FEMA)

m) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The site currently contains a 1.25 million gallon reinforced concrete reservoir covered with a geodesic dome. The reservoir will not be modified as part of the project. Therefore the project will not result in any change

in the risk of flooding from baseline conditions. California Government Code Section 8589.5 requires that the owners of certain dams designated by the Office of Emergency Services prepare and file with said office maps delineating the areas of potential flooding. The nearest identified dam inundation area is located approximately 0.9 miles from the project site. (County of Los Angeles CEO / ITS Emergency Management Systems)

n) Place structures in areas subject to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The project is not located in an area susceptible to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. (California Emergency Management Agency, University of Southern California, California Geological Survey)

11. LAND USE AND PLANNING

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The project does not change the use of the existing reservoir. The project involves the continued operations of the existing facility and also consists of demolishing an existing booster station building on the site and replacing it with a new booster station building of similar size and scale. Other new physical improvements including the installation of a dechlorination vault, underground piping, and new landscaping. These new improvements will not physically divide the community.

b) Be inconsistent with the plan designations of the subject property? Applicable plans include: the County General Plan, County specific plans, County local coastal plans, County area plans, County community/neighborhood plans, or Community Standards Districts.	☐	☐	☒	☐

The project does not conflict with the plan designation of the County General Plan. The General Plan land use designation for the subject property is 1 – Low Density Residential (1 to 6 du/ac). Currently areas within this designation, in addition to low density residential development, may have a variety of use types and intensities. Such uses typically include local commercial and industrial services, schools, churches, local parks and other community-serving public facilities. It is not the intent of General Plan policy to preclude further development or expansion of such uses within areas depicted as residential on the Land Use Policy Map. The existing facility has been at the current site since 1938 and the surrounding residential area developed around the facility in subsequent years. The proposed new water booster station will replace the existing booster station and will not change the use or character of the existing site. (Los Angeles County Code)

c) Be inconsistent with the zoning designation of the subject property?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The current zoning designation of the project site is R-1 (Single-family Residence). Water reservoirs, pumping stations, and any other use normal and appurtenant to the storage and distribution of water located in the R-1 Zone would have required a conditional use permit to operate starting on November 5, 1971. Because the existing reservoir facility was built prior to this effective date, its amortization period expired on November 5, 1991. Consistent with its obligations under California Public Utilities Commission General Order 103A, through this process California American Water has consulted with the County regarding the location of this facility. (Los Angeles County Code)

d) Conflict with Hillside Management Criteria, SEA Conformance Criteria, or other applicable land use criteria?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The Hillside Management Area Ordinance and hillside design standards do not apply to this project because

the site is not located in a hillside area. (Los Angeles County Code)

12. MINERAL RESOURCES

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	☐	☐	☒	☐

There are no known mineral resources located on the project site. (Los Angeles County General Plan – Special Management Areas)

b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The project site is not located within or contain an important mineral resource recovery site. (Los Angeles County General Plan – Special Management Areas)

13. NOISE

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
Would the project result in:				
a) Exposure of persons to, or generation of, noise levels in excess of standards established in the County noise ordinance (Los Angeles County Code, Title 12, Chapter 12.08) or the General Plan Noise Element?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The Los Angeles County Department of Public Health has reviewed the acoustical analysis of the proposed booster pumps submitted by the applicant and determined that the noise impact will be less than significant with the proposed engineering control (enclosure of the pumps below ground level and within a cement block building). Continued operation of the existing reservoir facility will result in no increase in noise compared to existing conditions, and the existence of a new sound wall may decrease the noise associated with the sporadic operation of the backup generator. (County of Los Angeles Public Health acoustical analysis 9/6/11)

b) Exposure of sensitive receptors (e.g., schools, hospitals, senior citizen facilities) to excessive noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	☒

No sensitive receptors are found within 500 ft. of the project site, although the site is surrounded by single-family homes. The Los Angeles County Department of Public Health has reviewed the acoustical analysis of the proposed booster pumps submitted by the applicant and determined that the noise impact will be less than significant with the proposed engineering control (enclosure of the pumps below ground level and within a cement block building). Continued operation of the existing reservoir facility will result in no increase in noise compared to existing conditions, and the existence of a new sound wall may decrease the noise associated with the sporadic operation of the backup generator. (County of Los Angeles Public Health acoustical analysis 9/6/11)

c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project, including noise from parking areas?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The new booster station will be constructed as a concrete masonry building to contain the noise from the new pump room. The surrounding single-family residences are located to the south and to the east of the proposed booster station location. The southern and eastern sides of the proposed booster station building do not have any openings to transmit noise into the surrounding neighborhood. Although the project site does not have any designated parking areas, adequate space is available for parking. The level of parking on the site will not be greater than existing parking needs and ambient noise levels from parking areas will not be greater than current baseline conditions. Continued operation of the existing reservoir facility will result in no increase in noise compared to existing conditions, and the existence of a new sound wall may decrease the noise associated with the sporadic operation of the backup generator. (Project Application)

d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in	☐	☐	☒	☐

ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project, including noise from amplified sound systems?

Short term construction noise would take place between 7 am to 4 pm, weekdays as the project is constructed. Construction will adhere to Los Angeles County code Section 12.08.440 addressing construction-related noise restrictions. The proposed backup generator would create periodic noise when in use during power outages. Noise from the backup generator will be minimized through the use of a sound enclosure surrounding the generator. Additionally, the backup generator will be located on a concrete pad surrounded by a sound wall. This will be an improvement to the existing pad which does not contain a sound wall.

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

The project is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of an airport. (Los Angeles County Airport Land Use Plan)

f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

The project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. (Los Angeles County Airport Land Use Plan)

14. POPULATION AND HOUSING

Would the project:	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Displace existing housing, especially affordable housing?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The project consists of the continued operation of the existing reservoir facility and the replacement of an existing water booster station with a new booster station. The project does not include any residential uses, nor does it involve the displacement of any residential uses. Therefore, this project will have no impact on population or housing resources.

15. PUBLIC SERVICES

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a) Would the project create capacity or service level problems, or result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
Fire protection?	☐	☐	☐	☒
Sheriff protection?	☐	☐	☐	☒
Schools?	☐	☐	☐	☒
Parks?	☐	☐	☐	☒
Libraries?	☐	☐	☐	☒
Other public facilities?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The project will not create an increased demand for these public services. The continued operation of the existing reservoir facility and proposed replacement of an existing booster station with a new booster station will not change the existing baseline conditions for the demand of public services. Fire and sheriff protection needs will be the same under the proposed project as they are for the existing facility. The project does not create new residences and therefore does not create any new demands for schools, parks, or libraries, or other non-utility public facilities. The replacement booster station includes the replacement of a portable restroom facility with the permanent restroom. The impacts to wastewater and landfill operations are discussed in the Utilities section.

16. RECREATION

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Is the project consistent with the Department of Parks and Recreation Strategic Asset Management Plan for 2020 (SAMP) and the County General Plan standards for the provision of parkland?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Would the project interfere with regional open space connectivity?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The project consists of the continued operation of the existing reservoir facility and replacement of an existing water booster station with a new booster station. The project does not create new residences and therefore does not create any new recreation needs.

17. TRANSPORTATION / TRAFFIC

Would the project:	*Potentially Significant Impact*	*Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing a measure of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation, including mass transit and non-motorized travel, and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit? Measures of performance effectiveness include those found in the most up-to-date Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) Regional Transportation Plan, County Congestion Management Plan, and County General Plan Mobility Element.	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Exceed the County Congestion Management Plan (CMP) Transportation Impact Analysis thresholds?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to, level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the CMP, for designated roads or highways (50 peak hour vehicles added by project traffic to a CMP highway system intersection or 150 peak hour trips added by project traffic to a mainline freeway link)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	☐	☐	☐	☒

f) Result in inadequate emergency access?	☐	☐	☒	☐
g) Conflict with the Bikeway Plan, Pedestrian Plan, Transit Oriented District development standards in the County General Plan Mobility Element, or other adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	☐	☐	☐	☒
h) Decrease the performance or safety of alternative transportation facilities?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The facility currently operates unmanned for the majority of the time. The replacement of the booster station will not cause an increase in the number of times employees would visit the site. Under normal operations, two employees would make periodic visits, typically 5 hours per week, to the site for regular maintenance and is consistent with current baseline traffic conditions. Other employees may visit the site spordacially, but the number and frequency of those visits is not capable of estimation. The project does not conflict with any adopted transportation plan or exceed any traffic threshold levels.

As shown in the air quality analysis, the construction of the construction of the new booster station and demolition of the existing booster station includes the use of approximately five different types of heavy equipment for construction activities. The equipment will be transported to the site at the beginning of construction and then removed when no longer needed to complete the project. Local traffic may be temporarily disrupted when this equipment is delivered or removed via large trucks entering or exiting from the site. The applicant will employ standard construction traffic controls to mitigate any impact from these activities.

The project will also temporarily generate a limited number of additional commercial vehicle trips for the delivery of construction materials. These deliveries will occur between 7 am and 4 pm. If necessary, the applicant will employ traffic controls should a delivery vehicle have the potential to obstruct traffic flow.

The project will also generate additional passenger vehicle traffic used by laborers, inspectors and engineers constructing the project. It is estimated that there may be up to 15 vehicles at the site during peak construction, operation, and inspection periods. It is not expected that all vehicles will arrive and depart to and from the site at the same time. Some vehicles may be parked on the streets adjacent to the project site. Based on existing conditions, it is not expected that additional passenger vehicle traffic will have a significant effect on current levels of service in the area or otherwise cause, or significantly increase any existing congestion in the area. Based on site visits, the project vicinity does not appear to have a shortage of on-street parking. Accordingly, project construction will have a less than significant impact on parking and traffic.

18. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the Los Angeles or Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Boards?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The project includes a new restroom facility within the booster station. The restroom will be used sporadically as employees make periodic maintenance visits to the facility; typically 5 hours per week. The amount of wastewater generated from this restroom is expected to be less than significant and does not exceed wastewater treatment requirements.

b) Create water or wastewater system capacity problems, or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The project includes a new restroom facility within the booster station. The restroom will be used sporadically as employees make periodic maintenance visits to the facility; typically 5 hours per week. The amount of wastewater generated from this restroom is expected to be less than significant and will not create wastewater system capacity problems.

c) Create drainage system capacity problems, or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The project does not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern on the site or change the applicant's use of drainage facilities. The overall amount of impermeable surfaces on the site will slightly increase by approximately 586 square feet due to the increased size of the new booster station, but the increase is considered to be less than significant and surface runoff amounts will not be significantly greater than current baseline amounts. No modifications are being proposed to the reservoir itself. The project will not create additional drainage capacity problems and will not create a need for construction of any new drainage facilities.

d) Have sufficient reliable water supplies available to serve the project demands from existing entitlements and resources, considering existing and projected water demands from other land uses?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The new booster station will improve the operation of the water distribution system by stabilizing system pressure during periods of peak demand and will not cause the system to be "over pressurized" and cause additional leaks in the distribution system. The Olympiad Reservoir and Booster Station supplies water to

two different zones of the distribution system – the Mt. Vernon Reservoir Zone and the Mt. Vernon Hydro Zone. The existing booster station pumps water in to the Olympiad Reservoir, which then uses gravity (a gravity-fed system) to distribute water to customers. The booster station also pumps water to an existing hydroneumatic tank that then serves the Mt. Vernon Hydro Zone. The new booster station will operate in the same fashion – three of the new pumps will feed water into the reservoir, which will use gravity to serve the Mt. Vernon Reservoir Zone of the distribution system, and one of the new pumps will deliver water to the Mt. Vernon Hydro Zone. Water system pressure to the Mt. Vernon Hydro Zone is controlled primarily by the Mt. Vernon hydroneumatic tank, not the pumps in the Olympiad Booster Station. The project incorporates variable frequency motors that regulate water pressure and reduce pressure fluctuations that now occur during peak demand periods. The system's water pressure will be within the acceptable pressure range as regulated by the California Public Utilities Commission (between 30 psi and 125 psi). California Plumbing Code requires pressure reducing devices to be installed on each home or business where the water utility's pressure exceeds 80 psi. The water distribution system operated by California American Water ends at the customer's water meter. The maintenance of pipes and installation of pressure reducing devices on the customer side of the meter are the responsibility of each individual customer per California Public Utilities rules. The project contemplates the use of water for dust control purposes during construction of the proposed booster station. The estimated consumption of water is 500 gallons per day over 10 days of construction. The applicant's existing pump station has delivered on average 900,000 gallons of water per day, with a declining consumption trend. The water used for dust control will be supplied from hydrants using the facility's water supply and represents 0.06 percent of the water this system has historically delivered, and will have a less than significant effect on water consumption associated with construction activities. In addition, the landscaping plan calls for replacing the existing vegetation with drought tolerant, native, and otherwise "California friendly" plant species, which is expected to result in a net decrease in water consumed from current baseline conditions for irrigation purposes at the site.

e) Create energy utility (electricity, natural gas, propane) system capacity problems, or result in the construction of new energy facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Part of the project consists of replacing old, existing equipment with newer, more efficient equipment. There are currently 4 booster pumps with efficiencies from 44% to 80%. The project will install four new pumps with the provision to add a fifth pup in the future. The new pumps will be more efficient than the existing pumps and have efficiencies of at least 80% and will result in reduced energy usage from existing conditions. All other operations are expected to remain the same as baseline conditions. There will not be a need to construct new energy facilities as a result of the project.

f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

The project would generate a minimal amount of new waste from the new restroom. The amount of waste is not considered to be significant from existing conditions and existing landfill facilities will be able to accommodate the facility's solid waste disposal needs.

g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

The project would generate a minimal amount of new waste from the new restroom. The amount of waste

is not considered to be significant from existing conditions and complies with statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

19. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

	Potentially Significant Impact	*Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated*	*Less Than Significant Impact*	*No Impact*
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	☐	☒	☐	☐

Biological Resources – The project has the potential to disturb nesting bird locations and discharge stormwater into the local storm sewer system that would eventually reach Ballona Creek. Mitigation measures that include conducting pre-construction nesting surveys and employing standard erosion control measures as required by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board for construction activities will reduce impacts to biological resources to less than significant.

b) Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term environmental goals to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The project considers both short-term and long-term environmental goals in its design, construction, and operation. Short-term environmental goals will not be achieved at the expense of long-term environmental goals.

c) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The project's cumulative impacts are similar to the cumulative impacts of the existing reservoir facility and are less than significant when compared to current baseline conditions of the project site.

d) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	☐	☒	☐	☐

Hydrology and Water Quality – The project has the potential to affect runoff water quality due to erosion during construction activities. Mitigation measures that include employing standard erosion control measures as required by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board for construction activities will reduce impacts to hydrology and water quality to less than significant. Neither construction activities nor

the new booster station will affect the potable water supply that is stored and distributed through the Olympiad Reservoir's facilities.